Appendix C - Transport Development Policies for Integrated Transport Block (ITB) funding allocation

The Council does not enforce speed limits, being a moving traffic offence and enforced by the Police. Neither is it the Councils role to dictate how the travelling public should use the Adopted Highway, seeking to only guide the public to the most appropriate route and is only responsible for ensuring that the Public Highway is safe for use for the travelling public. To achieve this, it actively seeks to reduce the number of Personal Injury Accidents (PIAs) on its network as the key performance indicator.

In order to achieve this, the Highways authority has developed a number of policies to provide treatment on the network to reduce PIAs on a data led approach and prioritised in accordance with the number and severity of accidents being the main consideration.

In July 2019, the Council's Cabinet approved the introduction of two policies that sought to address 2 accident problems on the network under the headings of TD Policy No.1 - Road Safety Engineering (RSE) and TD Policy No. 2 - Safer Routes to School (SRtS). RSE was identified to treat main routes in the borough (level 1 and 2 routes in the Council's Road Network Hierarchy), with SRtS focussing on roads around all of the boroughs 52 schools. The introduction of these programmes has however, identified a significant proportion of the highway that would not be reviewed as it was either classified as a low category road or away from nearby schools. As such, a new policy is required to include these roads within an assessment and priority procedure, whereby action can be taken to redress any safety risk for the travelling public.

TD Policy No. 3 - Area Intervention Programme (AIP) Policy

This policy is designed to treat roads that fall within the Level 3 Residential Street Classification of the Road Network Hierarchy or not within the TDP1 and TDP2 policies. These roads tend to be low trafficked routes that serve a residential access and individually tend to not see a significant amount of issues in relation to congestion and safety.

However, collectively a number of residential streets in an area may see an increase in issues, particularly if main routes become congested resulting in drivers seeking alternative routes. This can have a negative effect on these routes, which often sees drivers "rat-running" in a manner that is not in keeping with the area, such as speeding. Often this causes conflict due to high levels of on-street parking causing localised congestion and safety conflicts with other road users arise as a result.

As stated, these individual low cat roads do not see high levels of accidents upon them; however, it is often that in these locations even a fairly minor incident will have significant impact on the local area. Where major routes would likely have clusters of accidents in a single location, lower category roads would see a spreading of accidents over a collection of roads that would not identify a requirement for intervention. Nevertheless, when assessing these accidents under an area investigation process, there can be correlation that could result in intervention being an appropriate and proportionate response.

It is also noted that these roads tend to be designed to not support higher levels of traffic flow and may require intervention to remove conflicts and reduce the impact of vehicle movements. This requires assessment to include other improvements such as parking provision, access, public transport, etc. rather than solely focussing on direct accident remediation.

Priority locations

In much the same way the RSE programme identifies key routes to focus allocation of resources, this programme will seek to "package up" Level 3 roads that are in proximity to each other to define assessment areas.

The plan, in appendix 1, identifies the proposed areas (minus the RSE defined roads). A full list of roads included into each area is provided in Appendix 1 that accompanies the plan and will be reviewed annually to include any additional new roads adopted by the Highways Authority. All privately maintained highway will be excluded from the assessment. In total, there will be 28 areas within the assessment criteria

Assessment criteria

It is appropriate to utilise the Police CRASH data for the priority ranking, to ensure consistency with other policies and to ensure the data led approach is a prominent feature. However, it is identified that the defined areas are not similar in geographic size and some areas will see positive or negative bias. In order to eliminate this and to ensure that each area has a fair weighting, the accident analysis will provide assessment on PIAs / kilometre. There should still be a ranking system depending on severity of accident and it is identified that Fatalities should carry significantly more weighting that serious and slight accident classifications; i.e. fatally accidents are multiplied by a factor of 8, with serious by x4 and slights by x1.

Therefore the equation that will be applied is: $R = (\dfrac{3F + 2Se + 1Sl}{L\ (Km)}) \times 1000$

Where: R = Area accident score; F = No. of fatalities; Se = No. of Serious casualties;

       Sl = No. of Slight casualties; L = Kilometres of road in area

It is also identified to utilise a 5 years data set from the Police database to determine the priority list for treatment. This will be in the form of the latest data collated by the Police and it is identified that each area will use the same date parameters during investigations process. This is crucial to the delivery of scheme in a timely manner, but at the discretion of the Assistant Director, additional accident data could be included in the priority area if determined is appropriate for the need of the investigation and development of schemes.

Review and consultation

The review of the accidents may require further study to understand the issues within each area that may be unique to that particular area. As such, an extensive investigation programme will be made that will involve community engagement processes. It is envisioned that consultation will be invaluable to ascertain a local perspective of issues, so that solutions can be worked on accordingly.

As this process can take some time to complete, it is identified that feasibility and design will take up to 12 months to complete, with implementation programmed in accordingly thereafter. Some measures can be implemented quickly, with other measures demanding longer development time to

complete. As such it is identified that the whole project life for each area will take between 18 and 36 months to fully be implemented.